

CLARIFICATIONS ON THE 28 JAN 2005 GOES-R PDRR DRAFT RFP
Approved for Public Release

as of: 2 March 2005

CLARIFICATIONS (IN QUESTION AND ANSWER FORMAT) REGARDING THE GOES-R PDRR DRAFT RFP. THIS INFORMATION IS PROVIDED FOR THE BENEFIT OF POTENTIAL OFFERORS. HOWEVER, THE FINAL SOLICITATION—EXPECTED TO BE RELEASED ON OR ABOUT 15 MARCH 2005—MAY DIFFER IN SOME RESPECTS, AND POTENTIAL OFFERORS MUST RELY ON THE FINAL SOLICITATION.

1. **CDRL.** Does an offeror have latitude to tailor the CDRL in its proposal?

Yes. The draft RFP CDRL clearly says it is not imposed on an offeror and is neither mandatory nor exclusive—see the introductory words at the top of the draft RFP CDRL. It is an offeror's responsibility to propose a CDRL—

(i) that helps demonstrate the continued progress of the system during PDRR towards the PDR level of maturity (this will be evaluated as part of the source selection (for example, see Mission Capability Subfactor 2)); and

(ii) that supports the Government's need for information for PDRR contract administration, for preparation for the future A&O source selection, and for the future key decision point to proceed into the A&O phase (see SOO 5.10 and 5.15 through 5.17).

2. **CDRL.** What data will the Government require for the future key decision point to proceed into the A&O phase?

The exact requirements have not been established yet, but will be determined during PDRR contract performance—but an offeror should anticipate the future key decision point and propose such data as will allow the Government to confidently decide to proceed with the A&O phase. The GOES-R program office is using the Air Force's National Security Space Acquisition Policy 03-01 as a guide.

3. **CDRL.** Will an offeror's deviation from the draft RFP CDRL result in a "ding" in the evaluation?

The proposal will be evaluated in accordance with the evaluation criteria listed in the solicitation.

4. **Cost Modeling.** What contractor is the Government using for cost modeling support? What model or models will the Government using?

The Government may use cost modeling from a number of sources, and has not committed itself to a single contractor or a single model. During PDRR contract performance, more visibility into this question may be provided to PDRR contractors.

5. **Government Property.** Will the algorithms provided by the Government-led algorithm working group be provided as Government property?

CLARIFICATIONS ON THE 28 JAN 2005 GOES-R PDRR DRAFT RFP

No, as a Government property clause normally defines Government property. The Government-led algorithm working group's outputs should be seen as any other resource which might be available to the contractor. Algorithms provided by this working group would not be Government property imposed upon the contractor and the late and defective provisions of a Government property clause would not apply. The set of algorithms considered by the working group should not be seen as exclusive, and the contractor will retain responsibility for selecting and implementing the right algorithms and the resulting performance. A PDRR contractor will be a part of that working group and will contribute to its success (see SOO para. 5.14). The working group will likely hold joint meetings (involving all PDRR contractors) as well as individual one-on-one meetings.

6. **GPRD.** Will the Government update the GPRD before the source selection starts?

Probably not. However, the GPRD is going through an update process, and industry comments on the GPRD from the 30 Dec 2004 and 28 Jan 2005 postings have been provided to the GPRD team.

7. **Instruments.** Has the schedule for awarding NASA instrument contracts changed since the December 2004 Industry Day briefing?

The instrument schedule is always subject to change. If an updated schedule becomes available, it will be posted on the GOES-R website.

8. **Instruments.** What contract type will be used for the NASA instrument contracts?

The production contracts will likely be cost-plus-award-fee contracts.

9. **Instruments.** When will responsibility for instruments transfer from NASA contracts to the single system prime contractor?

This matter will be addressed during PDRR contract performance.

10. **Instruments.** Will the NASA instrument contracts contain scope for integration and test on the satellite?

This is the plan.

11. **MRD.** Do all the documents mentioned in the MRD exist today?

No. The MRD covers the life of the program, and some documents mentioned in it may be written during the PDRR or A&O phases.

12. **MRD.** Should the MRD include success criteria in the section where it discusses system availability?

Yes, but since success criteria are necessarily tied to architectural approach, the MRD will be updated to include a "TBD" for success criteria.

13. **MRD.** Why does the solicitation contain references to both the GPRD and the MRD, instead of just the MRD?

CLARIFICATIONS ON THE 28 JAN 2005 GOES-R PDRR DRAFT RFP

It is likely the MRD will stand alone as a requirements document for the future A&O acquisition. However, one of the main purposes of the PDRR phase is to prepare for the future A&O phase, and it is important that PDRR offerors and resulting contractors understand both the GPRD and the MRD. PDRR contractors will help identify and resolve differences between the two documents, and will contribute to the maturation of both documents.

14. **MRD.** Will there be an electronic link between the Government's DOORS database and a PDRR contractor's database?

No. Electronic files might be delivered back and forth, but each party must/will maintain its own database without electronic linkage.

15. **OCI.** What if a PDRR offeror is also involved in NASA instrument contracts?

The draft RFP asks each prime offeror to explain any potential organizational conflicts of interest in their proposed approach as well as plans to mitigate any OCIs. This discussion should include itself, its divisions or affiliates, and its subcontractors. (see L-102(e)(15)).

(i) Instrument information flowing to a PDRR team must not flow to any place where it might disadvantage the instrument contractor—this includes within the PDRR prime contractor's organization, its divisions or affiliates, and its subcontractors.

(ii) Every NASA instrument contractor and subcontractor should give fair treatment to all potential PDRR contractors.

16. **RFP/Section H/H-107.** Do PDRR contractors bear responsibility for cost associated with the Associate Contractor Agreements?

See para. (f) of the clause at H-107.

17. **RFP/Section H/H-107.** What level of interaction is expected under the Associate Contractor Agreements?

Each PDRR contractor may determine and seek the level of interaction it requires for its own PDRR approach. This may differ from contractor to contractor, and may also differ from instrument to instrument.

18. **RFP/Section H/H-112.** Does the H-112 clause apply to both successful and unsuccessful offerors?

Any Section H clause applies only to successful offerors.

19. **RFP/Section I.** Should the draft RFP contain the clause at FAR 52.227-14?

This will be addressed in the final solicitation.

20. **RFP/Section K.** May an offeror copy the information from the website, complete it on paper, and submit it instead of completing the process on-line?

CLARIFICATIONS ON THE 28 JAN 2005 GOES-R PDRR DRAFT RFP
If such a process will be allowed, it will be described in the final solicitation.

21. **RFP/Section K.** Will the Government provide a paper reps and certs package to an offeror who isn't registered in the On-Line Representations and Certifications Application (ORCA)?

No.

22. **RFP/Section L.** Does the Government require cost or pricing data, or information other than cost or pricing data?

No, not with the proposal. Adequate price competition is expected to show price reasonableness. Cost or pricing data, or information other than cost or pricing data, will be asked for only if adequate price competition does not exist—this will be determined after the proposals are submitted.

23. **RFP/Section L.** If there is a period of time for relevancy of past performance contracts, shouldn't it be found in Section L rather than in the past performance questionnaire?

Yes. The final solicitation will address this matter.

24. **RFP/Section L.** Is the Table L-110 too detailed for the PDRR phase?

The table may be revised in the final solicitation.

25. **RFP/Section L.** Since the solicitation asks for a life-cycle cost estimate, may an offeror use the numbers previously provided for the instruments for this purpose?

During the architecture study period, \$900M in FY03 dollars was estimated for development and production of the five baselined instruments.

26. **RFP/Section L.** When is the electronic version of the Past Performance volume due?

This will be addressed in the final solicitation—the electronic version will likely be due on the same day as the paper copy.

27. **RFP/Section L.** Will a classified past performance volume be allowed?

Any offeror desiring to submit a classified past performance volume must obtain the permission of the contracting officer (see L-101(c)).

28. **RFP/Section M.** Will the Government provide the minimum subcontracting goals?

The final solicitation will likely address this matter. Absent a contracting officer determination that the standard Commerce Department goals are not realistic, these will be used. An offeror may recommend reasonable goals to the contracting officer for his consideration and use in the final solicitation.

CLARIFICATIONS ON THE 28 JAN 2005 GOES-R PDRR DRAFT RFP
29. **Source Selection.** Will non-Government personnel supporting the PDRR source selection be covered by non-disclosure agreements?

All personnel supporting the source selection will sign non-disclosure conflict of interest statements identical to or substantially the same as the following—

Confidentiality Certificate

To Board Chairperson

In anticipation of my participation on the source evaluation board formed to evaluate proposals for the (acquisition title), I have read and understand the requirements for safeguarding and disclosing information. I certify that I will not disclose any information concerning the evaluation, the number of offers received, the identity of the offerors, or the contents of the proposals to any party who is not authorized access to the Board's information by law, regulation, or pursuant to the order of a court of competent jurisdiction, and then only to the extent that such information is required in connection with such person's official responsibilities. Furthermore, I will report to you any communication concerning the acquisition or the Board's composition and activities, from any party outside of the Board. I will keep all copies of proposals, evaluation reports, scoring sheets, notes, and all other materials pertaining to the Board's operations in a locked cabinet or file drawer when not being used. I will also return all of the documents when instructed.

Conflict of Interest Certificate

To Board Chairperson

I certify that I am not aware of any matter which might limit my ability to participate in the (acquisition title) proceedings and activities in an objective and unbiased manner or which might place me in a position of a conflict, real or apparent, between my responsibilities as a member of the Board and other interests.

In making this certification, I have considered all my stocks, bonds, other financial interests, and employment arrangements (past, present, or under consideration) and, to the extent known by me, all the financial interests and employment arrangements of my spouse, my minor children, and other members of my immediate household.

If, after the date of this certification, any person, firm, or other organization with which, to my knowledge, I (including my spouse, minor children, and other members of my immediate household) have a financial interest, or with which I have (or had) an employment arrangement, submits a proposal or otherwise becomes involved in the acquisition, I will notify the Board Chairperson and the Contracting Officer of this apparent conflict of interest. Until advised to the contrary, I will not participate further in any way (by rendering advice, making recommendations, voting or otherwise) in the work of this Board.

30. **WBS.** Does the Government's placement of the software at the two-digit WBS level (WBS 1.5) or the use of the word "segment" in 1.5 WBS element 1.5 suggest the Government expects a contractor to have a software organization separate from product organizations?

Raising software to a two-digit WBS level is intended to show the Government's keen interest in having visibility into software costs and progress—it is not necessarily

CLARIFICATIONS ON THE 28 JAN 2005 GOES-R PDRR DRAFT RFP
intended to drive an offeror's organizational or management structure or approach. Bearing the Government's interest in software visibility in mind, offerors are reminded that the draft RFP WBS clearly says it is not imposed on an offeror and that an offeror may propose a different WBS that fits its approach.

31. **WBS.** Shouldn't the solicitation ask for a PDRR WBS, instead of an A&O WBS?

No. The solicitation purposefully asks for a whole-program (A&O) WBS.

32. **WBS.** Will the WBS included in an offeror's PDRR proposal change before the future A&O source selection?

All program documents, including the WBS, may change during the PDRR phase as the program matures and approaches the A&O phase—this is the purpose of PDRR. Because the PDRR contracts will be FFP, they will not require cost reporting.

33. **Wrap-Up.** May an offeror rely on oral information from a Government official regarding the GOES-R PDRR source selection?

No. The GOES-R PDRR RFP will speak for itself, and anything said or written previously is subject to change when the final solicitation is released.